

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6507**

---

ANTHONY CLARK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

FRED B. THOMPSON, Interim Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Rock Hill. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge.  
(0:12-cv-02669-RBH)

---

Submitted: July 24, 2014

Decided: July 29, 2014

---

Before FLOYD and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Anthony Clark, Appellant Pro Se. Alphonso Simon, Jr., Assistant  
Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Clark seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Clark has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Clark's motions for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED